



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

this the terror of the Crown shielded the Jewry from any outburst of popular indignation. The sentence of the King condemned the Jews of Oxford to erect a cross of marble on the spot where the crime was committed ; but even this was remitted in part, and a less offensive place was allotted for the cross in an open plot by Merton College."

Mr. Green is not alone in ascribing the great ecclesiastical buildings as well as the great castles to the money bags of the Jewish capitalist. It may have been so, but has any distinct proof been produced ? In the Chronicle of Jocelyn de Brakelond we have a monastery borrowing of a Jew, as is known to the readers of *Past and Present*. But the Jews were banished from England by Edward I. in 1290 ; with which date the outlay on the building and extension of ecclesiastical edifices certainly did not cease. The date of the building of Salisbury Cathedral is 1220 to 1258, within the Jewish period ; but, if Murray's *Handbook to the Cathedrals* is to be trusted, we know whence the money came. The sum (40,000 marks) was raised by contributions from the prebendaries themselves ; by collections from different dioceses, to each of which a prebendary of Salisbury was sent ; and by liberal grants from various benefactors, such as Alicia de Bruere, who gave all the stone necessary for the work during twelve years. The general influence of Jewish capital is not doubtful. But in the case of ecclesiastical buildings the Church had in popular faith a great bank on which to draw.

At the origin of the university Mr. Green barely glances. In fact almost nothing can be known. The millenary of Alfred has called attention to his legendary character as founder. Popular fancy ascribes great institutions to great men. It ascribed to Alfred trial by jury, and the division of the shires. But it was the legend that caused the interpolation in Asser's Chronicle, not the interpolation in Asser's Chronicle that gave birth to the legend. Nor is there any real ground for suspecting of fabrication so respectable an antiquary as Camden.

GOLDWIN SMITH.

Essays in Historical Criticism. By EDWARD GAYLORD BOURNE. [Yale Bicentennial Publications.] (New York : Charles Scribner's Sons. 1901. Pp. xii, 304.)

Nor infrequently busy professors, who cannot find time for large compositions yet cannot be content to permit all their work to remain in an ephemeral form, rescue their articles from journals and make of them a book. Such books are likely to be distinctly miscellaneous, and Professor Bourne's is no exception to the rule. Yet there is a certain unity. The title well expresses it, and characterizes the writer, for in all his historical writing thus far published Mr. Bourne has revealed himself chiefly as a keen and accomplished historical critic.

But the phrase "historical criticism" has in current use more than one meaning. The professional student ordinarily uses it as meaning the critical discussion or dissection of the original sources or materials of history. Five of the essays in this volume are of this variety : the long dis-

cussion of "The Legend of Marcus Whitman" which occupies more than a third of the volume; two shorter essays on the vexed question of the authorship of certain numbers of the *Federalist*; and others, still more brief, on Madison's studies in the history of Federal government and on a passage in Seneca which has long been misinterpreted into a hint of the possibility of a westward voyage to the Indies. It is in historical criticism in this sense that Mr. Bourne, to the mind of the present reviewer, shows himself most acute and skilful. He has also a most remarkable gift of *Heuristik*. It is a modest and elusive book or bit of evidence that can escape his drag-net whence once he has roused himself to the task of sifting a historical statement to the bottom.

Another sense in which an article may be called an essay in historical criticism is that of an historical narrative based on such careful critical work as that to which we have adverted. Three examples of this sort stand in the book before us: a capital study of Prince Henry the Navigator, especially endeavoring to define his aims and methods; a thorough discussion of the demarcation line of Pope Alexander VI. and of the other definitions of boundary between the colonial possessions of Spain and those of Portugal; and the highly important and instructive paper on the "Proposed Absorption of Mexico in 1847-1848" which was printed in the fifth volume of this REVIEW. Critical estimates of historians may perhaps, though certainly in a less usual sense of the phrase, be called essays in historical criticism. Of these there are three. The best is an essay on Ranke, the careful and appreciative address which Mr. Bourne read before the American Historical Association in 1895. Those on Parkman and Froude are well written, but much slighter. The essay on Ranke's relations to the beginning of the seminary method in teaching history contains some repetition of matter already presented in that on Ranke, but it is in itself an excellent contribution.

Recurring to those parts of this handsome volume which consist of historical criticism in the stricter, or at any rate in the more technical sense, the reviewer feels obliged to say that to his mind Mr. Bourne's arguments respecting Madison's authorship of several of the disputed numbers of the *Federalist*, arguments from internal evidence, first published in this journal, seem practically conclusive. Those relating to the other numbers are almost as cogent, if indeed we may not say that all stand or fall together.

The *pièce de résistance* of the volume is the Whitman essay. Its criticisms of that famous legend have been developed much beyond the form in which they were originally published; and a much fuller history of the process by which it was disseminated is now presented. One cannot fail to admire the gifts of search which have enabled the writer to bring to bear upon his problem, with telling effect, bits of evidence from sources the most diverse. In some cases one feels that the cogency of the evidence is a little overestimated. But on the whole, in the judgment of the present reviewer, Mr. Bourne has abundantly proved his main contention. The Whitman legend is fatally damaged, so far as any

use of it by trained historical students is concerned. It cannot be upheld without ignoring the inferiority of long-subsequent recollections to contemporary documents as sources of history, an inferiority which the lay mind perpetually underestimates, but which the expert knows, by many striking instances, to be enormous. But the passionate revilings to which we have seen the accomplished critic subjected in many newspapers make it plain that the legend will die hard.

J. FRANKLIN JAMESON.

A History of Political Theories, Ancient and Mediæval. By WILLIAM ARCHIBALD DUNNING, Ph.D. (New York: The Macmillan Co. 1902. Pp. xxv, 360.)

It is rather remarkable that the historians of America should have shown themselves so apathetic in tracing the origin and history of those theories of the state which found a brief expression in the Declaration of Independence. In his *Essays on Government* Professor Lowell does not go back of Hooker, and until the appearance of the present work there was no good treatise in English on the political theories of ancient and mediæval times. Professor Dunning begins his book with Homer and concludes it with Machiavelli, limiting his considerations to Aryan peoples. Even within these limits he does not pretend to make the work an exhaustive treatise of the theories of all writers on the state, but selects those theorists who best represent the characteristics of political thought in the periods which he considers.

The author further limits the scope of his work by omitting all questions of ethics in relation to politics, and by confining himself to a consideration of "political theory in its relation to political fact". In accordance with such limitation we find each period of the work prefaced by an account of the political events and conditions of the times preceding and during the lives of the various theorists under consideration. The extremes of Athenian democracy are shown to have turned Plato to Spartan ideals, as the failure of the latter influenced Aristotle to favor democracy; while the city-state as the unit of government of the times formed the political horizon of both men. The interest of the Romans in the practical art of government blinded the learned among them to considerations of theory, and Polybius and Cicero did scarcely more than reproduce and develop Greek ideas. The Stoic philosophy and Christianity emphasized the ideas of equality and the brotherhood of man at a time when a way was being made for the establishment of the Roman papacy and the Holy Roman Empire. The later conflicts between these two forces of mediæval life determined the course which political speculation should take until the times of Machiavelli. This man, having in mind the fight for nationalities and the maintenance of one state against another rather than the struggles for supremacy between the ecclesiastical and temporal powers, was the first to abandon the threadbare theories of the papal and imperial protagonists, and the first to make a study of the